Serial No. 10/709,675 Examiner: Nicole R. Blan Filed: May 21, 2004 Group Art Unit: 1792

Page 7 of 9

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-29 are pending in this application. Claims 1-29 stand rejected. Claims 1 and 21 have been canceled and replaced with new claims 30 and 31, respectively. The dependency of the dependent claims have been amended to conform with the new independent claims.

Applicants believes the amendments made herein add no new matter. Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based on prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to be attached thereto. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The rejections in the current office action are identical to the rejections in the immediately prior office action mailed May 24, 2007. Applicants are still of the opinion that the bases for the various combinations are improper for the reasons stated in the August 24, 2007 Response. Therefore, for purposes of preserving the issue for appeal, Applicants reiterate and maintain the prior traversal of the various combinations with regard to the current rejections for the same reasons stated in the prior Response, but will not reproduce the arguments for ease of examination by the Examiner.

The rejections of claims 1 and 21 and the corresponding dependent claims are now moot in light of the cancellation of claims 1 and 21 and their replacement with substantive different claims 30 and 31. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

As new independent claims 30 and 31 are submitted in place of claims 1 and 21 and new claims 30 and 31 are substantively different, to advance prosecution of the application Applicants will comment on the rejections of claims 1 and 21 with respect to new claims 30 and 31.

New claims 30 and 31 each call for a solid-body elastomeric boot that has a recess for removably receiving the foot of the appliance. This basic structure of a solid-

Serial No. 10/709,675 Examiner: Nicole R. Blan Filed: May 21, 2004 Group Art Unit: 1792

Page 8 of 9

body boot is not shown in either of references (Moore '944 and Pool '986) forming the base combination for all of the rejections. Therefore, the base combination does not teach or suggest the claimed structure.

Bader '998 does appear to teach a solid-body boot, but Bader '998 does not teach a solid body that is deformable between first and second physical shapes corresponding to an isolating condition and a non-isolating condition, respectively. Bader '998 teaches shock absorbing by the inherent shock-absorbing nature of the material forming the boot of Bader '998. Bader '998 does not teach or suggest that the boot is deformable between two physical shapes where the force isolating function is related to the shape as is required by claims 30 and 31. Bader '998 does not teach one shape where the boot isolates forces acting on the boot from the floor and another shape where the forces are transferred to the floor. Bader '998 does not even teach that the boot is deformable between to physically different shapes.

None of the other references cited in the various combinations, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a solid-body elastomeric boot that is physically deformable between two physical shapes corresponding to a force isolating and a force non-isolating condition. Therefore, claims 30 and 31 are patentable over the primary combination and any variation thereof.

Serial No. 10/709,675 Filed: May 21, 2004

Page 9 of 9

Examiner: Nicole R. Blan

Group Art Unit: 1792

CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, all claims remaining in the application are allowable over the prior art. Early notification of allowability is respectfully requested.

If there are any remaining issues which the Examiner believes may be resolved in an interview, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted, DANIEL C. CONRAD, ET AL.

Dated: October 25, 2007 By: /Mark A. Davis/

Mark A. Davis, Reg. No. 37,118 Michael F. Kelly, Reg. No. 50,859 McGarry Bair PC 32 Market Ave., SW; Suite 500 Grand Rapids, MI 49503 (616) 742-3500

G0329303